THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII NOVEMBER, 1944 No. 293

Editorial

MR W. G. ADDISON'S *Religious Equality in Modern England, 1714-1914* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.) is an interesting essay in English church history, which we hope will be widely read. It records the extension of civil and religious liberty to the various classes of dissenters during the last two centuries and the loss of its privileged position by the Church of England. The Victorian era receives the most detailed attention. The results of the struggle for "emancipation" are now so much taken for granted that the long and curious course of the struggle has been forgotten. We easily suppose that "religious equality," like "democracy," is a venerable English tradition, and overlook the fact that it is only in quite recent times that these terms have come to be used in a favourable sense, and even so that there is no general agreement as to what they mean.

What does "religious equality" really mean? Mr Addison does not help very much here, perhaps because of his desire to provide an objective record of facts. He offers no definition of "religious equality." At one point he appears to identify it with "full freedom of religious association" (p. 72); at another he writes as though he regards the "absolute religious freedom" which is supposed to prevail in the U.S.A. as the ideal (p. 138). He does indeed once mention that "fundamental ethical issues" are involved (p. 129), but he has not attempted to show what precisely these issues are.

He professes to be an ardent Gladstonian Liberal. But it is no easier to discover from Mr Addison, than it was from Mr Gladstone himself, what exactly are the articles of his creed. From the body of the book we gather that anyhow it was a creed that became obsolete before the end of the last century. And we do not see what warrant Mr Addison has for concluding his introduction with these sentences:

> The substance of those fervent orations in which he (Gladstone) wrought his way to the faith of his maturity in freedom and equality, whether at the time they provoked applause or contempt, has been woven into the pattern of the social, public and political life of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations. And it is safe to say that with the defeat of the latest challenge to the Spirit of Man, the fundamental articles of the Gladstonian creed will become the foundational ethical principles of other Commonwealths and Constitutions. (P. 6.)

"Liberty implies equality: it means impartiality," we are told (p. 3). But we are not told whether this means that the State ought to be impartial with regard to all questions of religious belief and practice. Is a polity impartial in which the monarch is obliged to be a member

of an established Church? Does "impartial" mean indifferent or neutral or what? Even if the idea of impartiality were intelligible, would not its reality be impossible? And is not the notion that the State ought to have no preferences in regard to religious truth and falsehood one of those amoral theories which, when their implications are drawn out, are as shocking to Mr Addison as they were to Mr Gladstone? It is plausible only so long as it is supposed that ethics can dispense with religious sanctions and that we shall all agree about what is good, however much we differ about what is true.

Among the forgotten facts which Mr Addison brings to light is the fact that a hundred years ago the Protestant dissenters were consistent in their "voluntaryism." They held then that the State had no business to concern itself with religion, and that therefore education, like church worship, should be left to the voluntary provision of those who wanted it. They had changed their ground by the time the Education Act of 1870 was passed. And indeed it becomes most clear, when a State system of education is instituted, that the State cannot be impartial in regard to religion. If religion is excluded from the schools, as in America, this is to display a preference for a purely secular education. If an undenominational form of religious instruction is provided in the State schools, as in England, the scales are thereby heavily weighted against those who believe that it is wrong to divorce instruction in faith and morals from the confession and worship of the Church. Probably the nearest approach to impartiality or equality in this field is secured when, as in Holland, the State provides denominational schools wherever there is a demand for them. Even so, the equality can never be absolute.

Again, can there be absolute equality in broadcasting, and ought there to be? The Unitarians and others complain with some reason that they do not receive equal treatment at present. But ought the State to be impartial to all forms of religion? When Anglo-Saxons talk about absolute religious freedom they do not really mean that. They want freedom only for the forms of religion which they regard as sensible or decent, and they cannot understand how anybody can want anything else. A writer in *The Listener* (August 31, 1944, p. 241), discussing the religious policy of the B.B.C., speaks of "the right to hear all points of view on a question, and not only those which are officially approved," as "a fundamental democratic right." Ought then the State to provide facilities for Hindu, Moslem, Nazi and atheistic propaganda? Ought we to hear what there is to be said for temple-prostitution, polygamy and idolatry?

This whole question is much more difficult than appears at first sight, and it has yet to be thoroughly opened up in England. Apart from Creighton's Hulsean Lectures (*Persecution and Tolerance*, 1895), what attempt was made in the nineteenth century to get at the roots of the problem? The restrictions which had for long been imposed on dissenters from the established Church were removed because they had become hopelessly archaic. As Mr Addison shows, the pressure of social and economic forces had much to do with it—a good deal more, we may add, than Gladstone's fervent orations. No one in his senses

wants to revert to the régime of tests, in the efficacy of which our ancestors had a pathetic confidence. But we cannot see that our national polity is now based on any clear and agreed principle of "religious equality," and Mr Addison would have added to the usefulness of his book if he had pointed this out, instead of leaving it to be inferred. For we are all naturally reluctant to make such an inference.

A. R. V.

Lessons and Lectionaries

In the second volume of his *Retrospect* (p. 346) Bishop Henson quotes from his diary the reflections which came to him after hearing on a holiday a Yorkshire peer reading the Lessons in his parish church. True, the reader set aside the Lectionary "with a truly Protestant disregard of the rubric, reading lessons which he had himself selected." But the Bishop acutely remarks on the "superiority," which he had himself often noticed, "of the *educated* layman over the parson in this matter of reading the lessons," and attributes it, not improbably, to the comparative unfamiliarity of the layman with those Scripture passages with which the parson is almost too professionally familiar. "Generally," he concludes, "I do not approve of the common practice by which the reading of the lessons is entrusted to laymen, sometimes pious, but not always educated, and indeed, I think the clergyman who suffers this part of his duty to pass out of his own hands often deprives himself of a most valuable instrument of spiritual teaching."

Those are wise words which deserve to be laid to heart. For the reading of the Lessons in church is an important part of that ministry of the Word to which, no less than the ministry of the Sacraments, the clergy are commissioned. And in these days, when even our regular worshippers may seldom read the Bible for themselves, their only sustained acquaintance with the Scriptures may come from the Lessons read at the public service. The Lessons claim then to be read *intelligently* —that is, with a grasp of their meaning, which may involve some study ungrudgingly given beforehand in order to interpret them aright at the lectern. They should be read *audibly*—"distinctly with an audible voice," says the Prayer Book rubric, "he that readeth so standing and turning himself, as he may best be heard of all such as are present." (This requirement of commonsense surely should be held to apply equally to the Eucharistic Scriptures, and the absurdities of the rapid mumbling of Epistle and Gospel to the east wall rather than to the congregation should be once and for all abandoned as "dark and dumb ceremonies.") They should be read, above all, as if they truly were, and were known by reader and hearers alike to be, a message of the Word of God to *this* congregation, on *this* occasion. The dignity of this part of our ministry perhaps needs reassertion.

But the failure of such ministry to have its full effectiveness may be due neither to lack of education in the layman nor to inaudibility or carelessness in the parson. It may be due to defects in the Lectionary. For the reading of the Scriptures in church requires selection, and

Lessons demand Lectionaries. The question of the proper qualities of a good Lectionary has been raised afresh by the publication of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Amendment of the Revised Lectionary.[1]

But an even prior question requires consideration first. What exactly, of the many purposes of Scripture reading, is its purpose in public worship? Not merely instruction, though as we shall see instruction plays its part. Nor principally moral exhortation; for the primary purpose of the Offices is the worship of God, and not the subjective benefit of the congregation. Least of all, mere "literary appeal," though the spiritual value of great stories and great thoughts nobly expressed (and adequately delivered) must not be underestimated. But, after all, the primary purpose of the Offices is Godward—directed to the glory of God rather than the needs of man. The Scriptures are read therein primarily as the memorial of the mighty acts and messages of God towards His people—that is, as material for worship, and the close connexion between the Lessons and the Canticles must not be overlooked. Each Lesson has its response, a "Thanks be to God"; *Te Deum* —this God of Revelation we claim as our God, "we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord"; Benedictus, Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, the Evangelical Canticles, each proclaim the Church's experience of God's faithfulness to His promises under the Old Covenant and His fulfilment of them through Christ in the New. "To hear God's holy word" is a means "to set forth His most worthy praise." Yet "edification" plays its part: the edification, however, not merely of "mental and moral uplift," but of that "building up of the whole personality in Christ," which enables the worshipper to worship God better alike in the sanctuary and in the marketplace.[2]

It is against this background that Lectionaries need to be framed and judged. (1) First, then, we may presume that as much as possible of Scripture should be read, and the Prefaces of the Prayer Book are insistent upon this. Yet the Bible (especially the Old Testament) is frequently repetitive, nor need we claim that it is all on the same level. Some arrangement and selection are therefore required. (2) Such selection should be provided by the Church, not left to the discretion or indiscretion of the individual minister. This is partly to ensure breadth and balance in the choice. (We recollect Screwtape's satisfaction in the "little treadmill" of the parson's fifteen favourite Psalms and twenty favourite lessons, effectively preventing the entrance of any truth not already familiar to himself and his flock.) Still more, it is to assert the liturgical principle, that the worship of this congregation is a part of the worship of the whole Church, a principle driven to an extreme limit by Acts of Uniformity, but enshrining the rightful claims of obedience, humility and the corporate sense. (3) The Lectionary must provide a measure of continuity and regularity in its selection of readings. For Public Worship is intended to be regular, not sporadic, and there is no harm in the casual worshipper being tacitly reminded

[1] Obtainable from the Press and Publications Board, 2, Great Peter Street, Westminster. 1s.

[2] *Cf.* G. W. O. Addleshaw: *The High Church Tradition*, chapter 3.

of this. Moreover, as we have seen, the purpose of the Lessons is the memorial of God's work—an historic work in Revelation and Redemption, which should find expression in an orderly recital. In the first half of the Church's year an outline is provided by the successive seasons, to which the Lessons will be fitted. The second half affords opportunity for some more continuous reading to bring home in a different way the same truth of the historic "plan of redemption."

The Convocation Committee has confined its attention to the Sunday Lessons. The first English Lectionary of 1549, reacting violently against the medieval practices which it supplanted, provided Proper Lessons only for the greatest occasions, but Proper First Lessons for every Sunday were provided in the Elizabethan revision ten years later, and the next Lectionary, which did not appear till 1871, continued this practice. It was not till the Revised Lectionary of 1922 that the Sunday Lessons were entirely detached from the weekday course and framed into an independent Sunday Lectionary—an innovation on the whole wise and desirable. Those of the clergy who have honestly tried during the past twenty years to use it loyally and intelligently can appreciate its real merits as well as its inevitable blemishes. There is too frequent repetition of certain passages, especially from the latter part of Isaiah. There is too great a preponderance of the Prophets, which have in Epiphany and the latter part of Trinitytide no alternatives. Many of the Lessons are far too long, and one long Lesson is not compensated, as it might be, by a companion of greater brevity than usual. (The first Sunday evening after Epiphany combines Old Testament Lessons of 25 or 22 verses with a Gospel Lesson of 42 and a Psalm of 51, a total burden almost too heavy for the most loyal-minded parish priest to inflict upon his people.) But the greatest cause for dissatisfaction has proved, perhaps unexpectedly, to be the over-extensive provision of alternative Lessons. The intention of this was good. It was to give opportunity for the reading on Sundays of a much wider range of passages from Scripture than the Lectionary of 1871 allowed. If used on the plan recommended, this serves its purpose well —*e.g.*, if the historical Old Testament Lessons are read continuously one year, and the prophetic or Wisdom passages another; with the Gospel and Epistle passages continuously for the New Testament Lesson in alternate years. But the unhappy fact is that the multitude of choices thus available has gone far to break down both the sense of continuity in the reading of Scripture and of obligation to use what the Church provides rather than what the individual minister chooses.

The proposals of the Convocation Committee will therefore be scanned with pastoral concern by every good parish priest. The Committee has taken its work with the full seriousness demanded, and a tribute of thanks is due to its members, and particularly to the Convener, the Bishop of Winchester, who has clearly taken a very considerable part in producing the final result. The Report itself deserves to be read with care, for it describes with unusual frankness the experience of the Committee in facing the problems involved, and admits the reader to the reasons which led it to produce its proposals in

the form now offered to the Church. Two Tables of Lessons, A and B, are provided, to be used normally in alternate years. (The Scottish Episcopal Church has a similar arrangement with tables for three years.) Table A is in the main a careful and intelligent revision of the existing 1922 Lectionary, but *without alternative Lessons*, except on rare occasions or for special reasons. The provision of the second Table (B) makes possible the inclusion of the much larger selection of passages which was aimed at in the 1922 Lectionary. Only a few passages, such as could not be omitted in any year's reading, are duplicated in the two Tables. But Table B is deliberately something of an experiment, and claims to be rather an "Anthology" than a Lectionary of the more usual kind. During the first half of the Church's year, passages appropriate to the seasons are selected with considerable skill, though the story of the witch of Endor is a curious choice for Refreshment Sunday, and the fiery furnace of Daniel iii is an unexpected, though by no means unsuitable, selection for Passion Sunday. In the second part of the year, there is a roughly chronological sequence of Old Testament Lessons containing many passages we are glad to welcome—*e.g.*, the Ten Commandments, the book of Jonah (on two successive Sunday evenings), and some interesting additions to the selections from the Apocrypha. The Committee has indeed made a considerable feature of its extended use of the Apocrypha, though the plea that these passages "have a particularly strong appeal in this generation" is surely insufficient. The New Testament Lessons appear to suffer overmuch from being chosen on the "anthological" principle, though actual use alone can show. Moreover, where some sequence of Lessons is observable, it moves disconcertingly from Mattins to Evensong and back again. A series, *e.g.*, of Lessons from the Acts in the early Sundays after Trinity runs thus: two Sundays, morning; then two, evening; three, morning; two, evening. This is presumably an attempt to meet the (admittedly formidable) problem of those who come only once on a Sunday, but in fact will give neither morning nor evening congregation the satisfaction of continuous reading, nor the preacher the valuable opportunity of continuous exposition.

This matter of continuity is of real importance. The splendid series of Genesis Lessons from Septuagesima onwards is (one can only say wantonly) broken in Table A on Septuagesima morning itself (where Genesis i appears in Table B) and on Quinquagesima; while Sexagesima loses to Table B the traditional Genesis iii. Thus neither Table provides the complete sequence. This is a severe loss both to reading and preaching. Quinquagesima is sentimentally overstressed as the Sunday of Love, though the selections are deftly made. In both Tables the problem of length has been courageously faced. In some cases, a shortening of the passage has been skilfully accomplished by the omission of verses or by permissive curtailment. In others, the chapter has been divided between two Sundays (*e.g.*, Acts xxvii, the story of St Paul's shipwreck), or even three (St John xi, the raising of Lazarus). But the pendulum has perhaps swung too far in favour of brevity. Some of the great stories of Scripture deserve to be read in their completeness, and this is practicable if the companion Lesson is so arranged

as to be quite short. There are instances where this has been done (*e.g.*, Daniel iii of 30 verses has Romans v, 1-8 as a permissive companion). Yet some of the selections, especially in Table B, are almost too obviously snippets, and the too frequent use of very short lessons scarcely fits the dignity of Holy Scripture in the Offices of which Bible reading forms a main part.

But we do not wish to be over-critical. The Committee itself describes its work as "interesting and rewarding, but unexpectedly exacting," and pleads that those who use the Tables will be "mindful of the difficulties confronting all Lectionary builders." The points we have raised spring for the most part out of the principles of a good Lectionary from which we started. But we may well be grateful for many improvements which show insight into the practical difficulties of the parish priest—*e.g.*, the permission to read the story of the Epiphany on the Sunday after, as the Ascension story is provided on the following Sunday evening in the 1922 Lectionary. This secures that the story of the Feast itself shall be heard even by those who have not attended the weekday Eucharist. Again, the excellent provision in 1922 of the St Mark Passion on the five Sunday evenings in Lent is continued in Table A, while Table B most happily offers the Sermon on the Mount in five sections. The 2nd Sunday in Advent (Table B) is provided with Lessons on the Bible, including the happy choice of St Luke xxiv, 13-32 (the walk to Emmaus) at Evensong. Trinity Sunday (Table A) has alternative Second Lessons on the ministry, suitable to an Ordination Sunday. On occasion, the First and Second Lessons are arranged (an important scriptural principle) to illuminate each other—Jeremiah's call goes with the conversion of St Paul; David and the shewbread in 1 Samuel xxi with our Lord's teaching on the Sabbath, where He quotes the incident, in St. Mark ii, 18-end.

Finally, we are grateful for the many practical points touched on in the Report preceding the Tables. It is recommended that for certain passages, or even verses, the Revised Version should be used in preference to the Authorized, or *vice versa*. It gives no advice, however, on the comparative merits of the two versions for public worship. It is at least arguable that the greater accuracy of the Revised Version is (speaking generally) outbalanced by the smoother and more "liturgical" character of the Authorized Version language. The Committee assume that such introductory phrases as "Jesus said," "And Peter said," and the like will be provided. They are not always: nor even the necessary provision of the speaker's name for an opening "he said." Might we not also be encouraged to substitute the familiar forms Isaiah, Elijah, etc., for the Greek Esaias, Elias or Osee? It expresses a hope also that short introductions to these new Tables will be compiled, as they have been for the 1922 Lectionary. If so, it is greatly to be desired that such introductions should be more concerned with the spiritual value of the passage, and the purpose of its use in Christian worship, than with critical or historical details. (The old chapter headings in the Authorized Version—*e.g.*, of the Messianic chapters of Isaiah—are often an excellent model.) Moreover the relevance of a passage to a particular occasion needs pointing out. The story of the

walk to Emmaus, as read on "Bible Sunday" evening, has a quite different relevance from the same passage read on the evening of Easter Day.

Such points as these, small though they are, serve to emphasize the place of the Lessons in their liturgical context. They are part of a pattern; a pattern of corporate worship, based on the historic revelation and redemption of God in Christ, proclaimed by His people in the liturgy, itself enriched and interpreted by the Scriptures of His Church. It is greatly to be hoped that this new attempt to provide a worthy Lectionary will be permitted for experimental use, will be followed (as the Committee plead) "gladly and loyally," that through its means the hearers may, in the words of the Preface to the 1549 Prayer Book, "by hearing of holy Scripture read in the Church, continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of His true religion."

HENRY DE CANDOLE.

HENFIELD.

Breaking the Silence

ALONE among the Anglican churches of our time the Church of Ireland has lived through a revolution. In the late sixties the Anglo-Irish ascendancy was still almost as powerful as it had been a century before, for, as George Moore once remarked, the eighteenth century lasted in Ireland till 1870. Anglicanism, the religion of a small minority, was the established Church and to it belonged almost all the landed gentry, who formed the ruling class. To most Englishmen of the middle of the last century the Union of Ireland with Great Britain, brought about by Pitt, was a permanent political achievement which only folly or disloyalty would wish to see unsettled; to the Anglo-Irish as a whole—there were notable exceptions—the maintenance of the Union seemed a necessity of existence. Gladstone's great Disestablishment Act of 1870, which broke up the "United Church of England and Ireland," not merely disendowed the Church of Ireland and reduced it in the eyes of the law to a voluntary religious association, but began the ending of the Anglo-Irish régime. Next, the British Government, reluctantly and under pressure of events, first began to modify and finally at the beginning of this century abolished the whole system of land tenure. Peasant proprietorship was established and the gentry lost much of the economic basis of their political power. The establishment of democratically elected County and Rural Councils took the control of local government away from them. To the end the old ruling class had a strong influence over Dublin Castle, the seat of the British executive and bureaucracy. If it had compromised with the demand for political autonomy by the modification of the Union, Home Rule, it might have preserved much of the power that remained to it, but by the time that some of the wiser of the Anglo-Irish saw that there must be a compromise it was too late.

The Home Rule movement aimed at a limited measure of control over purely Irish affairs by a subordinate Irish legislature; matters of major importance such as foreign affairs were to be reserved for

Westminster. This movement was resisted passionately both in England and in Ireland, and it ended in frustration. There followed the Rising of 1916 and the period of guerrilla war. The ideal of republican independence was sanctified for many by the blood of political martyrs and Home Rule would no longer have satisfied the majority of Irish Nationalists. The British Government in the end yielded far more to force than it ever had been willing to grant to a constitutional movement, and in 1921 the Treaty ended the old order in Ireland for ever. The political struggle for independence had coalesced with a cultural movement, originally non-political, for the preservation and revival of the Gaelic language and culture as distinctive of Irish nationality. It was the combination of these two ideals, the political independence of a Gaelic State, which achieved a partial victory in 1921.

Today as a result of these developments Ireland is partitioned into two states. Over the greater part of the island there exists a semi-republican régime loosely affiliated to the British Commonwealth and "dedicated to the proposition" that Ireland ought to be and must be made a Gaelic state. This cultural ideal, it may be said, appears to many Irishmen to be of doubtful value, and to perhaps as many its realization seems impossible. But it is the officially accepted ideal in Southern Ireland for the present and dominates the whole educational policy of the state. In the rest of the country, the Six Counties of Northern Ireland, often incorrectly referred to as Ulster, a modified form of the Union with Great Britain exists and is cherished by the majority of the people. The area has a considerable measure of autonomy under its provincial government but remains part of the United Kingdom. It is here that the Orange Order, that unique Irish organization, still flourishes, and the Glorious Revolution of 1688 is still a living memory. It is easier in this part of Ireland than an outsider can imagine to read English Protestant pamphlets of eighty or ninety years ago as if they were contemporary documents.

There are elderly members of the Church of Ireland who have seen all these changes happening, and for many of its older members something of the old order still lingers on in nostalgic recollection. For the Church as a body the experience of these changes has had important consequences—a decline in numbers, important alterations in the territorial distribution of its membership with resulting problems of organization, a loss of political and social power, and a weakening of vitality. In social and political power it has suffered more than any other Irish religious body. In the South the Roman Church has gained in power, at any rate externally. The setting up of the Northern state has increased the prestige and influence of the local Presbyterianism which is deeply rooted in the Northern tradition.[1] Irish Presbyterianism is concentrated in the North, and unlike the Church of Ireland it could lose its whole membership outside the Northern six counties without any serious modification of its structure or injury to its tradition.

[1] Slightly less than one-third of the inhabitants of Northern Ireland are Presbyterian, but the social influence of the Presbyterian tradition is far greater than this would seem to imply. The one-third is a determining minority moulding the social life of the area.

To put the facts in another way, there have existed in Ireland in modern times three social groups[1]: the Anglo-Irish culture, whose heart was the Church of Ireland and whose brain was Trinity College; the "Scotch-Irish," mainly concentrated in the North, Presbyterian in religion, and comprising in its characteristic types the business man and the small farmer; and the "native" Irish, Roman Catholic in religion and only lately beginning to develop a bourgeoisie. The effect of the political and social changes has been to break the power of the Anglo-Irish and to weaken gravely that Anglo-Irish culture by which Ireland has chiefly been known in the modern world. The other two social groups have consolidated their power. To be more accurate, the régime in the North is something of a compromise between the Belfast industrialists and the remains of the old gentry, but the former are the predominating element, and culturally the area is Presbyterian. One might sum up the results of all this for the Church by saying that there has developed a tendency towards provincialism of ethos, a tendency perhaps to shrink from the full position of a church to that of a sect. The end of the old order was inevitable; if men had been wiser the end might have come in some other form. It appears to have come in the worst possible form for the Anglo-Irish.

In the years since the old order ended for good and all an odd silence has prevailed. There has been as far as I can remember no discussion in print of the Church of Ireland's position and prospects. The silence has now been broken by a pamphlet from the pen of an influential layman of the post-Treaty generation,[2] Dr W. B. Stanford. To many of us who belong to that generation the old order is a part of the past that can be surveyed dispassionately, but to many of our elders and indeed to some of our contemporaries it still possesses a ghostly reality. It is to their subconscious imagination the order that should exist even if it does not. This is quite natural, and it helps to account for the touch of the archaic which both fascinates and perplexes some English visitors in much of the Anglicanism of Dublin. Dr Stanford may help to dispel some of this nostalgic unrealism, and he deserves the general thanks for breaking a harmful silence. His pamphlet is addressed to the ordinary churchman in the South, the man in the Southern pew, and the more readers it finds the better.

The new order in the South inevitably brought difficulties for the Unionist minority despite the desire of the new government to be scrupulously fair. There were bound to be not only political but also religious difficulties. If the average Irish Protestant has little idea of the intellectual majesty of the Roman Church that is not entirely his fault. He cannot be entirely blamed if he judges the great Church of the West by the attitude of a sectarian society to the appointments in the gift of a Rural Council or by the attitude of those who consider the Irish censorship a bulwark of Christian culture. (But can even the

[1] This is a very simplified description of a very complicated situation. The three groups overlap and interpenetrate, but can be distinguished as real entities in Irish life. I am speaking of cultural groups and am not concerned with "racial" questions. Yeats was the last great typical figure of the Anglo-Irish culture.

[2] *A Recognized Church.* By W. B. Stanford, Litt.D. A.P.C.K., Dublin and Belfast. 9d.

bitter complexities of Irish history excuse a common Protestant blindness to the magnificence of that vivid supernatural faith and devotion which is so notable among our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen?) No one is likely seriously to deny that what Dr Stanford describes as "pressure" on the Church of Ireland does exist—difficulties over public appointments, the suspicion of clerical interference, and the like. But I think that he is too much inclined to explain by the deliberate action of Roman Catholicism what is largely the inevitable result of circumstances. A minority is by definition a group subjected to the pressure of a social atmosphere which it did not create. The nature and degree of the pressure largely depend on the proportion it bears to the surrounding majority. If it is sufficiently large it can secure a stable position; there is a level below which a minority cannot fall without its extinction becoming inevitable.

Dr Stanford is concerned with the practical problem of the Church's healthy existence in contemporary Southern Ireland, and the advice he gives is excellent. He is quite right to emphasize that Irish churchpeople must face the difficulties of their environment and accept with active loyalty the responsibilities of citizenship. A passive acquiescence which dreams of the vanished past is more than dangerous. He points out well how uncertain the future is for Ireland as for everywhere else. But one wishes he had pushed his analysis farther and shown that the complexity of the situation that the Church of Ireland has to deal with results from a continuing obsession with a political problem, which is quite genuinely a problem but is superficially conceived—an obsession which prevents men from seeing that the problem is set in the context of the whole European revolutionary transformation of our time.

The Irish revolution was fought for the principle of nationality; it was a typical assertion of that great nineteenth-century principle. It still dominates men's minds in Ireland, positively and negatively, because it has not yet reached its final development. In the South opposition to the prevailing narrow cultural nationalism is mainly expressed in terms of a British allegiance which can be as narrow and as provincial as what it opposes. The two great ideals of the dominant political tradition in the South are Gaelicization and the achievement of national unity by the incorporation into Eire of the dissident Six Counties. In the North the one great prevailing political principle is opposition to this incorporation and the resolve to maintain the connexion with Britain.[1] The question of nationalism both in North and South so takes up men's minds that insufficient attention is given to questions more important for the Christian man today. "That the world has entered into a revolutionary period is a fact which we can but accept . . . that far-reaching transformations are inevitable is a fact which is independent of the will of our generation." These words of Maritain are even more

[1] This dominates the political life of the North. One-third of its inhabitants are Roman Catholic Nationalists who are opposed not merely to the Government in power but to the continued existence of the régime. They desire incorporation into the South. The majority opposed to this feel they cannot permit themselves the luxury of political divisions. Round this question political life has frozen.

obviously true than they were when written ten years ago. In Ireland the great question is still one on the political level, or rather it is a combination of this political question with religious complications. But the Ireland still dominated by this problem is part of a European civilization which has entered on a period of profound sociological transformation whose end no man can foresee. We do not know whether the realities of power politics will continue to permit the absolute independence of the smaller sovereign states. We do know that for the Christian of the West in the coming years the great problems will be the emergence of the planned society, the power of secularism, the developments of the post-Christian outlook, and the possibility of a democratic totalitarianism. Not to see that these are the problems is to be blind to one's historical responsibilities. And yet if one's main political concern is a naive British imperialism asserted against a narrow cultural nationalism, or the converse, if one's politics are purely local in this bad way, one must be blind to the realities. In the North of Ireland this blindness can be seen in a remarkably crude form. The coincidence of religious and political divisions leads to a unified politico-religious or religio-political outlook in which the local Protestantism is fused with the local Unionism. The dominant creed is Protestant-Unionism, and the hyphen in the compound is all-important. As Barth remarked of a similar compound elsewhere, the hyphen becomes the real test of orthodoxy. The Orange Order is the concrete institutional embodiment of this religio-political outlook, but the outlook is not confined to its membership. It is general.[1] When the Christian faith is thus compounded with a local and provincial political creed it is no longer a source of illumination lighting up the realities of man's social life. At best it can be an individualistic pietism, at the worst it is a sanctification of men's political egoism and self-assertion. It is very difficult to forecast the religious developments of the North, for the indigenous religious tradition, evangelical puritanism, is visibly disintegrating. The process of disintegration has gone far but has not yet reached its term. In the process of disintegration the traditional ability to resist the evil effects of secularism and fusion with a political outlook is weakening.

The tendency towards provincialism can thus be seen both in the South and the North. In the South there is the danger of the Church becoming a small introspective body concerned with its own inner life. In the North there is the danger, from the sustained pressure of the local atmosphere and the weakening of the Anglo-Irish cultural tradition, of the Church coming to accept passively the status of one of several co-ordinate Protestant denominations whose differences are as nothing in comparison with the religio-political unity which they

[1] The ecclesiastical dignitary who informed a gratified audience that if Spain had had Orange Lodges it would have been spared civil war, and who edified a collection of devout and honourable women at a missionary bazaar with the news that "the head of the Chinese Government is a keen and enthusiastic Christian, ready at any time to fight for Britain," may achieve on such occasions a uniquely personal degree of rich fatuity, but he is a representative figure. Such grotesque utterances awaken no *surprise* in the hearers who enjoy or endure them.

share.[1] In either case if these tendencies are unchecked the result will be that the Church will shrink to the status of a sect. And if the Church is not what it claims to be, a national Church, what reason is there for its existence? It matters little to its claim to be national that its numbers are small. What matters is the sense of having a mission to, a responsibility for, the nation. The mere profession of claims to ecclesiastical continuity and the canonical occupation of the ancient sees will not prevent a Church from dwindling to a sect if this sense of mission and vocation be lost.

The weakening in spiritual vitality which one often hears discussed, and in which the Church is said to resemble a man who "feels run down," is partly a result of the difficulties we have been considering. But there is another cause—the decay of the old integral Evangelicism. This is disintegrating everywhere, but most noticeably in the North, into either an insignificant fundamentalism or the shallowness of some more or less Liberal pietism. Despite its narrowness and many weaknesses the old Evangelicism was a real religion. It could apprehend the dimensions of height and depth in human experience; it could realize, even if it could not accurately assess, the tragic plight of man in the contradictions by which his existence is torn. It is gone and no adequate successor has taken its place as a dominating influence in the life of the Church. Moderate good churchmanship—in which the Oxford Movement has chiefly borne fruit in Ireland—cannot satisfy, for it cannot understand, the agonies and exultations of the human spirit. But this sober ecclesiastical piety is much superior to the various brands of emotional Liberalism[2] which are so often the residuary legatees of the older Evangelicism. This has gone for good. But there is the possibility in the Church of Ireland of a genuine theological revival which would unite the insights of the Evangelical tradition with a full understanding of the doctrines of the mystical body and man's supernatural destiny. A genuinely theological revival, a renewed apprehension of the Gospel of God as the Gospel of God in the world of our time, would revitalize the Church and would manifest itself in a realistic Christian insight into the sociological situation, a liberation from imprisonment in problems that are local and limited. And it is only from such a theological renewal that there could come the increase in literary activity that Dr Stanford rightly desires. *Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur.* Theology in the real sense, as distinguished from dissertations produced for the sake of producing dissertations, springs from such theological vitality at the deepest level of the Church's existence. It would be foolish to underestimate the gravity of the situation in which the Irish Church stands, but time still remains for a renewal of life, and from such a renewal the Church could both make a

---

[1] A movement towards the left in politics is a real possibility in the younger generation of the North. This might have serious consequences for religion if the fusion with the local political orthodoxy endures.

[2] These varieties of Protestantism in decline are destined to be absorbed into the general semi-Christian ethical idealism of the Anglo-Saxon culture. They have not sufficient theological integrity to resist such absorption. In Johnson's phrase, they have not enough vitality to preserve themselves from putrefaction.

rich contribution to the whole life of Anglicanism and fulfil its mission to Ireland. It still enjoys opportunities and advantages almost unique in contemporary Anglicanism. The time remaining is short, and may be very short, but time yet remains.

R. P. McDermott.

Hawarden.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHAT IS ANGLICANISM?

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

As has already been properly pointed out by Mr R. P. McDermott in your columns (June, 1944), Anglicanism is no longer a purely English phenomenon, and if justifiable is not justifiable on the grounds of its Englishness. It may be useful to contribute to the discussion some evidence from China, where the results of many missions of every Anglican hue, and from England, Ireland, the U.S.A., and Canada, have given rise to a Church which is becoming, if it is not already, an indigenous Chinese Church with a character of its own and an awareness of its own nature and mission.

The Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui, or S.K.H. for short (this is its only proper title and we hope that ecumenically-minded persons will learn to read and write it, if not pronounce it), is the product of the missions of, among others, the C.M.S., S.P.G., C.E.Z.M.S., B.C.M.S., C.I.M., American Church Mission, and Church of England in Canada Mission. In pre-war days in what is now occupied China, the Mission was perhaps more obvious than the Church. In war-time West China, the Church is much more obvious than the Mission. In Chungking, an extreme example, which is in the C.I.M.-supported diocese of Eastern Szechuan, there had been no pre-war S.K.H. work; but three interdenominational churches had S.K.H. pastors and a strong S.K.H. flavour, and the ordained or missionary personnel came from American Church Mission, C.I.M., and C.M.S. backgrounds. One's Mission in such a situation meant little; one's membership of the S.K.H. a great deal. The situation is not substantially different in Kweiyang or Kunming.

The Sheng Kung Hui is, by comparison with the Church of Christ in China (in which are united the Churches of the American and British Presbyterians, the London Mission, the English Baptists and others), the Methodist Church, or the American Baptist Churches, a small denomination. For various reasons, there is a far less degree of understanding among the Protestant groups in China of the Catholic tradition than is the case in England. Between Rome (more than half of all Christians in China) and all non-Roman groups there is, broadly speaking, a great gulf fixed; and there is not even an accepted Chinese word for Christians of all confessions.

The fidelity of the Sheng Kung Hui to the tradition of "Western Reformed Catholicism" thus serves to mark it off clearly from the

other non-Roman Churches. I should tentatively define the differentiæ as follows:

1. The use of liturgical worship with a service book, and with clergy and choir in cassock and surplice, and sometimes vestments.

2. A much greater emphasis than is common elsewhere on the Eucharist, and by comparison a more complicated and solemn rite.

3. A much greater emphasis on the Church. It is probably true that the members of the S.K.H. are, broadly speaking, considerably more aware of themselves as members of the S.K.H. than is the case in other denominations.

4. A greater emphasis on clerical leadership, for which we probably have to thank especially the policy of the American Church Mission. Chinese friends in other Churches have assured me that the S.K.H. has in its Chinese bishops a larger, abler, and more respected group of Christian leaders than other Churches can boast. (There are at present four Chinese diocesans.)

5. A relative absence of the institutional type of church with a multitude of activities; we are sometimes accused of not *doing* much.

6. A certain aloofness, institutional rather than personal, from other groups—sometimes due to a sense of separateness and trusteeship for "Western Reformed Catholicism," sometimes to the usual factors of sin and folly, and most frequently to a combination of both.

At the same time, the propriety of using the term "Western Reformed Catholicism" is limited:

1. We are dealing with China and not with Europe. Whatever may be the status in European theology of the Greek philosophical tradition, there appears no genuine theological reason for supposing that it will be final in other cultures. Archdeacon Allen has pointed out earlier in these pages that Chinese theology hardly yet exists. When it does come into existence, the task of philosophical theology will be rather to state the Christian view of the world in relation to Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism. Further, if the Greek and Latin Christian tradition has been affected by the fact that the Christians were members of a Greek or Latin culture, we may expect and should look forward to a similar colouring of the Chinese Christian tradition. These are elementary points; I am not clear that our thinking about the future of "the Christian tradition" has yet absorbed them. It is still largely parochial, European, and not yet ecumenical.

2. So far as the missionary personnel goes, a larger part than in England is Protestant rather than Catholic. I have not infrequently met Chinese who would very quickly be at home in the faith and worship of reformed Catholicism—if they had ever met it.

3. The General Synod of the Church has not met since before 1937, and although groups of bishops have continued to meet from time to time there has been no official meeting of the House of Bishops since Pearl Harbour. It is easy for foreign missionaries to discuss the nature of the Sheng Kung Hui, but it is easy for us to leave all realities behind when we do so. The character, style, and atmosphere of the Sheng Kung Hui will depend on its growth in China among the Chinese. While we may hope for an increasingly close fellowship with the other

churches in communion with Canterbury, the influence of foreign missionaries in China or of mission boards in the older Churches, on the development of the Church, will steadily and properly decrease.

Indeed, it is arguable that the present structure of official relationships between the Sheng Kung Hui and the Church of England, for example, is out of date. Its analogue in the political field is the Colonial Office and the colony; what we now require is something more like the relation of Canada to the Dominions Office.

This reconstruction cannot, however, as has been hinted, be confined to the sphere of "mission and church relationships." The discussion of the question "What is Anglicanism?" cannot, if it is to keep close to reality, be confined to the Anglicanism of England; how, for example, about the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., to say nothing of the Churches of China, India, and Japan, of the Dominions, and of Africa and the South Seas? "Anglicanism" has demonstrated, to my personal knowledge in America, China and India, and presumably everywhere else, considerable viability. It is *there*, a fact. The sociological approach is admittedly inadequate; but it is as essential a preliminary to the theological discussion of the question as is the psychological diagnosis of a neurotic to his cure through spiritual direction, confession, and the sacraments. Put very crudely: we must know what we are talking about. This will mean a lot of study; and the study will be complicated by the fact of change, which in some places may be very rapid.

Yours faithfully,
DAVID M. PATON.

NEW DELHI,
EN ROUTE CHUNGKING-LONDON.

BOOK REVIEWS

GLORY IN THE FACE. By Olga Levertoff. East London Fund for the Jews. 2s.

THE MESSAGE OF JESUS FOR OUR TIMES. By W. M. Ryburn. Christian Literature Society, Madras. 6 annas.

CHRISTENDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD. By G. Holland. C.L.S., Madras. 8 annas.

Of these three pamphlets that of Miss Levertoff stands in a quite different category from the rest. Described as "Considerations upon a Pauline theme and its relationship to Jewish Mysticism," it adds one more item to the debt that the Church owes to that distinguished Jewish Christian Dr Levertoff, for his daughter makes no claim to originality. Father Gillet has been emphasizing the need for a more effective "dialogue" between Jews and Christians. This beautifully written essay should help considerably. Miss Levertoff combines knowledge of her Jewish sources with a sensitive appreciation of Christian theology; her excursions into verse are perhaps less happy. Two quotations may be permitted. "As the grapes must be trodden and the skin left behind in the winepress, in order that the good wine should gush forth, so does pure love towards God pour forth from our hearts only when it is trodden out humbly in God's winepress, and the

skin of our self-righteousness left behind. . . . God can only dwell in broken vessels. The aim of all creation is 'bittul hayesh'—*i.e.*, ceasing from being something apart from God; to die in order to be raised to life again." Later we find these words: "The Face He turns upon us is dark with the wrath of innocent men betrayed, stained with the blood of the martyrs, fretted with the furrows of a poverty more bitter than death. It turns upon us in the sweat of the factory, in the dust of the mine: it is made visible in bomb-riven streets, by the ghastly glow of burning homes—it writhes in the death-agony of the enemy whom we have slain. It is bowed to the yoke that binds the hostage; it looks at us from every ghetto in Europe."

To turn from this to the two pamphlets from India is to exchange good wine for very small beer. Mr Holland is an army chaplain who calls for the reunion of Christendom in order that the Church may fulfil her task of converting and sustaining the world. He protests against ideas of future judgment and a second advent on the grounds that our Lord is at work in the Church now and our task is a present one. Somehow the note of prophecy just does *not* sound. The Church's call to action cannot come merely from the external pressure of secular events, however urgent, but as the result of hearing afresh the Word of God. Mr Holland's danger is to drag the Church behind the chariot wheels of a secularist need for world unity. The reunion of Christendom achieved on this basis and for this reason will be as useful as the coerced reunion of Christians in Japan. If Mr Holland tends to give us internationalist liberalism faintly tinged with religion, Mr Ryburn covers well-worn ground by rehashing the old material and once more presents us with Jesus as a teacher of lofty morality and liberal ethics. What he says is edifying and devotional, but once again the tension and the *bite* of the Gospel are simply not there. Neither of these writers has much sense of the Church. Mr Ryburn pleads for a religion which "is not dependent on externals and traditions and authority of priests or Church, but the religion which is founded on the personal experience of God and His love in life and heart." This excessive anti-institutionalism is typical of Indian Christianity at the moment. Thoughtful Indians need something much more adequate than the nourishment which Christians in India offer them. One Hindu professor after reading Maritain and Luigi Sturzo remarked that the greatest contribution to India was the idea of the Church and it had never been seriously presented to India. It is sad that India, faced with so many and so great problems, is still offered Christianity in a very diluted form.

These two pamphlets can be obtained from 4, Bouverie Street, London, E.C.4, at 1s. 3d. each.

In addition to these three pamphlets one may mention *The Church and the Land*, being services for use in villages linking the liturgy with the soil. They have the support of the Bishop of Salisbury and are published by S.P.C.K. (4d.).

From Ireland comes a pamphlet on *The Discussion Group*, by R. P. C. Hanson, and an attractive little book for young communicants by the Rev. Claude Chavasse.[1] This, while remaining within the limits of the

[1] *Draw Near with Faith.* (S.P.C.K., London. 6d.)

standard of worship and ritual permitted by the Church of Ireland, is pleasantly illustrated and admirably devised. Both these are obtainable from the Dublin Association for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

L. M. Schiff.

Spennymoor.

Alfred Loisy: His Religious Significance. By M. D. Petre. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

This admirable little book, the last from the pen of the late Miss Petre, is a worthy tribute to her friend Alfred Loisy, who died in June, 1940, just two and a half years before her own death. She herself kept within the Roman Catholic Church to her death; but she remained a champion and friend of Loisy as much after his excommunication as before it. She was faithful to the end to that lost cause for which he worked so hard in his earlier days, though he himself ceased to be a Modernist when he was driven out of the Church.

Loisy, before his excommunication, desired to use his intellectual gifts to work out an apologetic for the authority of his Church's dogmas in the face of modern scientific and historical knowledge; he wanted to develop a "religious science in and for the Church" over against "a science of religion outside Catholicism and in opposition to it": he ended in being cast outside his Church and in taking his place within the ranks of those he set out to oppose. Loisy the Modernist and Roman Catholic apologist died in 1907; and to most English theologians he lived on only as a student of the origins of religion, a biblical critic holding fantastic views and bitterly opposed to Christian orthodoxy, and an isolated and not very important scholar. Miss Petre has done well to show how shallow is such an opinion of this unique French savant. And she makes out a case for supposing that the apologist of the early days lived on and that his later works are not without their significance for the Church to which he ceased to belong: "he had no longer any ambition to be a 'Father of the Church' . . . but he did endeavour to be, in a humble measure, an apostle of human religion," and "as a Catholic, I am furthermore interested in the question as to what elements of his teaching may be deemed to have a true and permanent value, not only for religion in general, but even for the Christian and the Catholic religion." Whatever may be the judgment of history about him—and the time is not yet ready for a proper assessment—and whether we agree or disagree with all that Miss Petre says in this book about her friend, she makes it difficult for us to neglect the important part played by Loisy in the field of moral and religious problems. No serious student of the history of Christian thought and action, no careful critic of the Christian origins, no honest Christian apologist, can well afford to ignore the work he did.

Miss Petre has not written a biography: that was not her intention. Her purpose in writing has been to show that Loisy's main interest was always religion, and to interpret his religious significance to her compatriots. Part I is biographical, but only in order to lend support to her thesis—it adds nothing new, except a few intimate touches, to what is already known of him by those who have been closely ac-

quainted with him and with his works. Part II, generously drawing upon quotations from his writings, discusses Loisy's attitude to some of the major problems of Christian theology; and the last chapter sums up what the author thinks is his contribution to their solution.

Those who knew Loisy personally can verify that for him the religious interest always remained dominant. He was desperately concerned with the moral and spiritual welfare of humanity, and he believed that his work as a biblical critic was a contribution to that end. But I doubt whether Miss Petre is fully justified in her claims about his religious significance. He well knew that morality and religion do not develop from individualistic speculation "but from a more profound sentiment . . . that of solidarity, of the bond which binds the individual to family and society making him a member of a body. . . ." But in his own isolation, proudly denying his debt to others and doggedly insisting on remaining alone, resentful of any criticism, it was impossible that he should find adequate solutions to the problems he tackled. It is not so much the contributions he makes to the theological problem of reconciling Christian dogmas with modern scientific and historical knowledge that are vital—important as they are—as the witness he bears to the crisis which faces theology in the modern world, to the nature of that crisis, and to the necessity of meeting it with courage and without the prejudice of a ready-made and shoddy solution. Faith and reason: to the just claims of both he gave full allowance. But, unlike so many of his critics, he was not content with a "slick" compromise between them. A lone figure, courageous, honest and diligent, he discerned the full extent of the crisis; but, in trying to resolve it, he never rested at any time in the belief that he had succeeded in his purpose.

L. J. Collins.

Seven Archbishops. By Sidney Dark. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1944.

Mr Dark's most recent work has all the qualities for which his other writings have been noted—a pleasing style, trenchant argument and obvious sincerity; but it yet remains the least satisfactory. Mr Dark wants to show how the Church lost the respect and devotion of the masses as soon as the archbishops abdicated their political authority and as soon as money power gained the chief hold in society. He takes seven archbishops and treats them as the puppets of his argument. Anselm, Becket and Laud represent the true traditions of the Catholic Church; Cranmer, Potter, Howley and Tait the Erastian acquiescence in the power of an increasingly capitalistic state. The book must be judged then as *un livre de circonstance*, an interesting piece of political and ecclesiastical propaganda rather than as a scholarly contribution to the history of the Church.

Now, it is obviously true that a Church which denies its political and social obligations becomes stagnant and corrupt, and there is much to be said for Mr Dark's general conclusions.[1] It is doubtful, however,

[1] The histories of the Russian and Spanish Churches are cases in point. There is, in Spanish church history, a glorious period, theologically and historically, between 1500 and 1650, followed by a period of increasing decadence.

whether Mr Dark has the requisite knowledge and necessary sobriety of judgment for tackling his task successfully. His theme—"while the Church of England was the champion of the poor and of the oppressed, it exercised a great and salutary influence on the national life"—is excellent; but there is no indication that he has paid the slightest attention to the writings of his archbishops—neither to Anselm's *Opera*, to the Rolls series of *Materials for the Life of St Thomas à Becket*, nor to Cranmer's works.

Indeed the way in which he has interpreted his fundamental theme can be criticized at every step. Neither Anselm nor Becket can be principally regarded as the champions of an oppressed people against feudal tyranny. Anselm was an attractive scholar and above all else a champion of papal authority. Becket, on the other hand, sincere if histrionic, challenged Henry II's conservatism on behalf of the Church, and, more fundamental still, the increasingly systematized canon law. Mr Dark does not seem to have consulted Dr Z. N. Brooke's *The English Church and the Papacy*. Cranmer was neither so servile nor so unprincipled as Mr Dark makes him out to be. The Church owes much to Charles I and Laud, but it should be remembered that their policy was at any rate incidentally brought about by their championship of the Tudor idea of sovereignty. Mr Dark, however, does well to emphasize the Catholic nature of Laud's theology (though to describe him as "a St Anselm rationalist" is unscholarly), for the seventeenth century is "El Siglo de Oro" of Anglican theology. Potter was certainly, by comparison with Laud, or even Tillotson, a "cipher," but Mr Dark has used his chapter on Potter for a very one-sided picture of the eighteenth-century Church (again Mr Dark would have done well to pay attention to Professor Sykes' *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century*, particularly with regard to the Nonjurors), whilst his treatment of Tait is unsympathetic. In fact the archbishops have, with few exceptions, been the archetypes rather than the architects of their age, and Mr Dark should have been content to have treated them as individuals rather than as tags for a sermon that is at times historically false.

Unfortunately the book falls between two stools, the stool of journalism and the stool of history. No bibliography is given, but references are made frequently to popular, and sometimes old-fashioned, textbooks. No attempt has been made to measure the real personal, theological, or historical importance of the archbishops. There are innumerable questionable statements. To state that Anselm anticipated Hegel needs qualification. Chichele founds St John's College on page 75, but on page 118 Mr Dark speaks of the college, in connexion with Laud, rightly, as a recent foundation. The statute *De heretico comburendo* (which appears on page 103 as *De Heretico Comburendo* and in the index as *De Heritico Comburendo*) was passed in 1401 and *not* in 1399, and strengthened rather than initiated legal procedure for dealing with heretics. "The Renaissance in Italy was a pagan revolt against Christianity" is a rash generalization, whilst, sympathetic as one may be to Mr Dark's emphasis on the Catholic nature of the Church of England, his denigration of Puritanism is ludicrous and

unjust. Thomas Cromwell may have been Machiavellian and unpleasant, but he was not a "16th century Nazi." In one place Mr Dark says that the "rule of Mammon . . . began in England with the dissolution of the monasteries" and in another place "money . . . shouted when William of Orange was King of England," but neither statement can be wholly accepted. "Holy Days were holidays" in the Middle Ages, but every serious student recognizes that manorial custom often overrode ecclesiastical convention and the Church uniformly condemned the various bride ales, scot ales, church ales, whitsun ales, etc., which were their normal accompaniment. Potter is recommended for studying the Fathers, "an interest rare in England at this time," but this was the period when Dean John Fell of Christ Church was editing Athenagoras and Clement and when patristic study loomed large in Anglican writings. It was in 1637, *not* 1627, that Jenny Geddes threw her stool in St Giles' Cathedral. Ken was Bishop of Bath and Wells and *not* Bishop of Winchester. And so one could unfortunately continue. Dr E. A. Abbott, author of *St Thomas of Canterbury* (1898), appears as "Abbot" in the text and as "Abbott" in the index, where he is apparently identified with Laud's predecessor, Archbishop Abbot, and Abbot's brother, the Oxford vice-chancellor. Other errors (probably of proof-reading) include: " Gorsseteste" (p. 71), "Bollard" (Professor A. F. Pollard, impertinently dismissed as a "staunch Protestant and an unconscious humourist") (p. 79), "praemuraire" (p. 84), "Tunstal" on p. 89 and "Tunstall" on p. 100," "syphlitic" (p. 88), "Andrews" (p. 116), "Burnett" (p. 103—not mentioned in the index), but "Burnet" (p. 156), "Bemberton" (p. 130), "Wootton" on p. 238 and "Wotton" on p. 130, "Cromeell" (p. 150), "Liebnitz" (p. 170), "Syndey" (p. 179), "Fitz-Urze" (p. 235), "Paschal II" on p. 33 and "Pascall II" on p. 236, "Whitfield" on p. 163 and "Whitefield" on p. 169.

Mr Dark has marred an interesting and readable book by a superficial and frequently inaccurate interpretation of the evidence. The intrinsic Catholicity of the Anglican Church and the Church's contribution to national life through her social teaching could form a most interesting and valuable study, but to serve its purpose the fundamentals must be historically and theologically sound.

SHERBORNE. V. H. H. GREEN.

WHEN THOU PRAYEST. By E. G. Daunt. A.P.C.K., Dublin. 1s.

RUSSIAN LETTERS OF DIRECTION, 1834-1860. Trans. Iulia de Beausobre. Dacre Press. 5s.

Mr Daunt's little booklet is a collection of five addresses on Prayer given at lunch-hour services held during a Dublin Youth Conference. They are sound and practical, without saying anything new or going very deep, and give ample evidence of that firm theological basis which people are beginning to expect in Church of Ireland products. We would like Mr Daunt to have added to them a further instruction on Difficulties in Prayer; perhaps some day he will do this. Meanwhile his booklet serves as an admirable example of what can be done in a short time at Youth Conferences and such like.

Russian Letters of Direction is a fascinating work, not only because of the personality of the writer, a nineteenth-century "holy man," or πνευματικὸς πατήρ, of Optino in Central Russia, but also because of the skill with which the translator has performed her task. Not only had she to translate, but to perform prodigies of arrangement and grouping from the 447 Russian originals issued in 1880 in book form with a disconcerting lack of any method or order. The result of her labours is an attractive book of some 100 pages, in which extracts from Macarius' letters are grouped under the Beatitudes. There is also an Introduction and a few Notes at the end with quotations from Western mystics to illustrate similarities between the Christian East and West. Certainly these quotations (which are from St John of the Cross and St Catherine of Siena mainly) are striking, and anyone familiar with spiritual directors such as Fénelon, Daniel Considine, Bernard Clements, or Dom John Chapman, must be repeatedly reminded of them, too, in reading these Russian counsels.

Macarius' insistence on Pride as the root sin, and on the practice of Humility as its cure, is outstanding. Thus "great storms of passion are allowed to assail us when we have been indulging pride . . . the medicine is simple, a sincere humbling of self." "I was distressed to learn you are still as irritable as ever. Fear of God, love, and humility are the medicine. Pride is the root of it." Once we are "in the high country of self-esteem," a "dark mist enshrouds our intellect," and we are led away from God without even suspecting it, as we would if faced with cruder temptations to display, or worldliness, or the lusts of the flesh. "Pray simply. Do not expect to find in your heart any remarkable gift of prayer. . . . Repeat constantly: I am not worthy; but say it calmly, without agitation. This humble prayer, unlike the sweet one you delight in, *will* be acceptable to God." There is much valuable advice on prayer scattered throughout the book, recalling similar writing in the West. Those who assume that the Orthodox conscience was not awake to social inequalities may find evidence to the contrary on pp. 62-66. Many touches of humour brighten the letters: "as to this girl who has so much impressed you, why not marry her?"; and tiresome correspondents are firmly dealt with: "your condemnation of the nuns of X is as wrong as your ideas on monasticism are erroneous." The different context in which he writes is revealed by the writers he quotes, not even names to most Westerns; by the references to the "Jesus Prayer"; and by the evident nervousness about frequent communion; communion every six weeks may mean "excessive zeal" or "give occasion to pride." This is a delightful book, to buy and read again and again.

Glyn Simon.

Llandaff.

Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition. By S. L. Bethell. King and Staples. 10s. 6d.

Fashionable literary criticism depends much more solidly on some dogma or ideological prejudice than it did a generation ago. The story of literature is now told in relation to "man's social background," or to "the spirit of England," or to a Christian or a Marxist or an anarchist

anthropology. The dilettanti have been replaced by the earnest inspectors of principles. Criticism nowadays is rarely the expression of individual taste resting lightly on undisclosed prejudices or convictions, but is more commonly the blunt elaboration of some dogmatically held position.

The scheme of Mr Bethell's treatment of Shakespeare is fashionable. It depends on an explicit sharp distinction between two kinds of drama, the "conventional" and the "naturalistic." The "conventional" is highly stylized, and makes constant use of certain accepted symbols and means of displaying character, developing the action, and entertaining the audience. The "naturalistic" approaches much more closely the scenes, characters, and conversation of actual life. Shakespeare writes the former kind, and a dramatist like Ibsen the latter.

This is a fruitful distinction. There can be no doubt that Mr Bethell, in following Schücking and in discarding Bradley, is in the true stream of modern criticism. Indeed, he probably pays Schücking less respect than is due to one from whom he has clearly learned so much. The conventions of the verse-forms, of episodic intensification, of characters speaking "out of character" in order to further the action or reveal some necessary trait in another character (as Iago's *I am determinéd to be a villain* or Olivia's *O you are sick of self-love, Malvolio*) were carefully discussed by Schücking over twenty years ago. There can likewise be no longer any doubt about the strong roots which Shakespeare's drama has struck in medieval and Tudor art. Writers like Stoll, Schücking, Tillyard, and now Mr Bethell, make it clear that only incorrigible Bradleians are still free to calculate the number of Lady Macbeth's children, or Juliet's age, or to claim insight into the Duke's character in virtue of his indecent haste to leave the forest of Arden. In brief, Mr Bethell zealously teaches that the integrity of Shakespeare's work has to be judged in the light of its acknowledged conventions and its interior adequacy of effect. (Yet, so tenacious is the older view, even Mr Bethell talks of "the uncertain structure of *Hamlet*"—whereas by his own critical standards the only proper question is whether the particular conventions used are able to achieve dramatic integrity; and the popularity of *Hamlet* with playgoers is sufficient answer to that.)

Mr Bethell also makes great play with what he calls the "principle of multi-consciousness" in the popular dramatic tradition, whose "dominant characteristic is the audience's ability to respond spontaneously and unconsciously on more than one plane of attention at the same time." This analysis of the "willing suspension of disbelief" smoothes the way for inquiry into the critical confusion, for example, that arises from the fact that the dumb-show in *Hamlet* has no effect on Claudius. It is altogether a happy insistence on Mr Bethell's part that the temper and capabilities of a modern cinema audience should be analysed and compared with those of the Elizabethans; this is surely more to the point than the luxuriant psychological investigations of past generations of critics.

But Mr Bethell drives his principles too hard. Admittedly Shakespeare uses certain conventions and depends on a certain ability in his audience which together constitute part of his dramatic integrity.

But the contrast with "naturalistic" drama is by no means so effective. Shakespeare as much as Ibsen is seeking his illusion; to our reflective historical regard his conventions are more obvious than Ibsen's; but the fact that Ibsen's plays look and act more like life than Shakespeare's does not make them any the more life. Surely the only valid critical approach is to recognize that all art has its conventions, is always μίμησις and never life itself.[1]

The consequences of this dogmatic over-emphasis in Mr Bethell's book are not, however, at all disastrous. The bulk of it consists of shrewd and careful handling of Shakespeare's main work, and is a solid, instructive, and illuminating addition to Shakespeare scholarship.

RONALD MAXWELL.

THE CONFESSIONS OF ST AUGUSTINE. Translated by F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

The publishers justify the issue of this latest translation of the *Confessions* on the ground that, since "most of the existing translations are in an English that is now archaic," there is need of a modern version that will convey to the present generation the enduring "contemporaneousness" of this spiritual classic. The new version, they add, is not for scholars; and they modestly claim no more for it than that it will give "a reasonable idea of what St Augustine said." On the whole, Mr Sheed has succeeded in his undertaking. As regards language and style, he has given us a rendering that, apart from an occasional clumsiness, is both readable and easy to follow. He would do well, though, to revise the punctuation, which can only be described as slipshod. In particular, the insertion of much-needed commas would clarify many passages. Once or twice, too, his sense of fitness has deserted him—for instance, when he renders *Unde hoc monstrum?* (VIII. ix) as "Why this monstrousness?"; and it is a little unfortunate that, in a book that betrays its transatlantic origin by its spelling, Matt. xix, 12*b* should be given in the form *He that can take it, let him take it.* It is hard to say, without collating the whole of it, whether this version does in fact give "a reasonable idea" of what St Augustine wrote; but the examination of a number of selected passages suggests that it does, in spite of some minor inaccuracies.

The book is poorly produced, even for war-time. Internal evidence suggests that it was published first in America and then printed photographically over here; and perhaps that is why the typography is faintly unpleasant. The table of contents seems to have been stuck in after the rest of the book had been sewn; and in the review copy a few pages are crumpled, a few torn at the edges. There are, however, far fewer misprints than one is accustomed to finding nowadays.

LINCOLN. G. B. BENTLEY.

[1] This is platitudinous; yet I cannot forbear the pleasure of referring the reader to an essay by R. G. Collingwood in *Mind* (1925) on "Plato's Philosophy of Art" which could clear up much contemporary confusion about art—a confusion apparent even in Mr Bethell's long-drawn out comparison between "conventional" and "naturalistic" art.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher